



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,515	12/05/2003	Anoop Anantha	306116.01/MFCP,149744	2367
45809	7590	03/16/2010	EXAMINER	
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613			TRAORE, FATOUMATA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2436		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/16/2010	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/729,515	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ANANTHA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> FATOUMATA TRAORE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/IDS/68)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 17, 2009 has been entered.

### ***Status of Claims***

2. Claim 1 has been amended; Claim 17 has been cancelled. Claims 1-16 and 18-32 are pending and have been considered below.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 and 18-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-16 are system claims, however the examiner notes that all of the components of the system are software per se which the applicant has defined in the specification (page 6, lines 11-25) to encompass a process running on a processor, a processor, an object, an executable, a

thread of execution, a program, and/or a computer. A computer program is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. A computer program is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. A computer program is not a combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, a computer program by itself does not fall within any of the four categories of invention. Therefore, Claim 1-16 are not statutory.

Claims 31 and 32 are directed data packet and or a data structure stored on a computer storage medium, however the examiner notes that a data packet or data structure are not program and can not be executes. A data packet/data structure is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. A data packet is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. A data packet is not a combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, data packet stored in a computer readable storage medium does not fall within any of the four categories of invention. Therefore, Claims 31 and 32 are not statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner notes to the applicant:

The rejection can be overcome by executing one of the following options:

- 1) Pointing out to the examiner, the structure and algorithm for invoking the means plus function rule from the specification.

- 2) Strike the means plus function claim language from the claim.
- 3) Cancel the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-16, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Reunert et al (US 7,418,426).

***Claims 1 and 30:*** Reunert et al discloses a system that facilitates access to a plurality of shared software objects by disparate entities(*column 3, lines 50-60*), comprising:

- i. a platform component that receives a request to access an object by a first entity, wherein the first entity is attempting to convert a subscription from a second type of a second entity to a type of the first entity(*column 8, lines 1-20; column 12, lines 47-54, lines 60-65*);
- ii. a data store that stores security information on classes of the objects, wherein the security information includes a security parameter that indicates whether the first entity is permitted to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type(*column 7, lines 10-27*); and
- iii. a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the first entity has permission to call an Application Programming Interface (API) for the object to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type(*column 7, lines 1-10; column 15, lines 43-45*), wherein the verification

component prevents the first entity from calling the API when the security parameter indicates that the first entity is not permitted to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type and the verification allows the first entity to call the API when the security parameter indicates that the first entity is permitted to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type(column 6, line 65 to column 7, line 10).

*Claim 32:* Reunert et al disclose a computer readable storage medium having a data structure stored thereon, the data structure comprising

- i. At least one security field indicating global security parameters in a subscription platform database, wherein the global security parameters include at least a security parameter for conversion of a subscription of a subscriber from a first type associated with a first tenant to a second type associated with a second tenant, wherein the security parameter for conversion indicates allow ability of the second tenant to convert the subscription from the first type to the second type column 8, lines 1-20; column 12, lines 47-54, lines 60-65);
- ii. At least one object field associated with an account in the database(*column 8, 20-45*); and

iii. At least one class field to associate the security field and the object field  
(*column 8, lines 20-45*).

**Claim 2:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose the verification component exposes the object to the entity if permission exists (*column 4, lines 21-35*).

**Claim 3:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the verification component masks the object from the entity if permission does not exist (*column 4, lines 21-35*).

**Claim 4:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the platform further comprising a Subscription Platform Service to facilitate automated billing and provisioning of accounts(*column 3, lines 50-65*).

**Claim 5:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the verification component facilitates that the entity receive full access to Application Programming Interfaces (API's) and/or objects for which there is a business need and partial or limited access to other API's or business objects(*column 6, lines 6-20*).

**Claim 6:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the data store provides default or determined security information related to a class (*column 13, lines 19-25*).

**Claim 7:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 6 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising a component to override the default security information with higher or different security options (*column 13, lines 1-15*).

**Claim 8:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the

system further comprising a proxy tenant component wherein an intermediate entity places calls into a subscription platform service on behalf of another entity and achieves access to selected objects in order for the another entity to complete a subscription purchase (*column 4, lines 20-35*).

**Claim 9:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising a management portal to facilitate authorization of information (*column 15, lines 40-45*).

**Claim 10:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose a component to provide an explicit security mapping for an object (*column 13, lines 32-40*).

**Claim 11:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose a component to enable an implicit security mapping from an explicitly mapped object or to derive an implied security permission by utilizing related objects(*column 13, lines 32-40*).

**Claim 12:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the verification component employs operating system identities to facilitate security authorization procedures (*column 15, lines 40-45*).

**Claim 13:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising at least one of a sign-up API caller, an account management API caller, and a customer care API caller(*Fig. 1 items 60-70*).

**Claim 14:** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 13 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising at least one API related to at least one of a sign-up API

group, an account management API group, a customer care API group, and an object designer API group (*Fig. 1, items 60-70*).

***Claim 15:*** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising authorization logic that determines whether an API can access an object via an access rights set (*column 15, lines 40-45*).

***Claim 16:*** Reunert et al disclose a system as in claim 1 above, and further disclose that the system further comprising at least one of a restricted audience offer, a conversion component, and a payment instrument component (*column 8, lines 55-65*).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 18-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reunert et al (US 7,418,426) in view of Zothner (US 6,751,657).

***Claim 18:*** Reunert et al disclose a method to facilitate security for subscription objects, comprising:

i. Storing one or more security options in a database, the security options related to an automated billing and provisioning system, wherein the security options include at least conversion of a subscription from a first type associated with a first tenant to a second type associated with a second tenant, wherein the

security option indicates allow ability of the second tenant to convert the subscription type from the first type to the second type *column 8, lines 50-60; column 12, lines 47-54, lines 60-65*);

ii. Assigning the security options to a class(*column 8, lines 20-45*); and

Reunert et al is silent about inheriting the security options by object members of the class. However, Zothner discloses a method for notification subscription filtering based on user role, which further discloses:

Inheriting the security options by object members of the class(*column 17, lines 53-65*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Reunert et al to include inheriting security options. One would have been motivated to do in order to reduce development cost (see column 2, lines 62-67 of Zothner).

**Claim 19:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Zothner further discloses that the method further comprising at least one of explicitly and implicitly assigning the security options to the object members of the class(*column 3, lines 35-55*).

**Claim 20:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Zothner further discloses that the further comprising accessing the database via an application-programming interface (API) (*column 15, lines 40-45*).

**Claim 21:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 20 above, and

Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising automatically authorizing the API (*column 6, lines 6-20*).

**Claim 22:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 21 above, and Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising returning an error code if an authorization procedure fails(*column 21, lines 10-28*).

**Claim 23:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 21 above, and Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising analyzing a simple object access protocol request(*column 6, lines 33-48*).

**Claim 24:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 21 above, and Zothner further discloses that the method further comprising analyzing one or more security credentials(*column 8, lines 20-40*).

**Claim 25:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 24 above, and Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising employing a cache to process the credentials(*column 8, lines 20-40*).

**Claim 26:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Reunert further disclose that the automated billing and provisioning system further comprising a Subscription Platform Service (*column 3, lines 50-65*).

**Claim 27:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Reunert further disclose that the security options are associated with default security parameters (*column 13, lines 19-25*).

**Claim 28:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising overriding the default

security parameters with other security options(*column 13, lines 1-15*).

**Claim 29:** Reunert et al and Zothner disclose the method as in claim 18 above, and Reunert further disclose that the method further comprising employing an intermediate proxy that places calls into a subscription platform service on behalf of another tenant(*column 4, lines 20-35*).

**Claim 31:** Reunert et al disclose a data packet stored on a computer readable storage medium that when transmitted facilitates communications between at least two components of an subscription platform service(*column 3, lines 50-60*), comprising

- i. an Application Programming Interface packet to identify a first partner(*column 8, lines 20-45*);
- ii. a security credential packet to facilitate authorization of the first partner(*column 8, lines 20-45*); and
- ii. a security parameter packet inherited by a business object to facilitate access to a subscription platform database, wherein the security parameter packet includes at least a security parameter for conversion of a subscription of a subscriber from a second type associated with a second partner to a first type associated with the first partner, wherein the security parameter indicates allow ability of the first partner to convert the subscription from the second type to the first type (*column 8, lines 1-20; column 12, lines 47-54, lines 60-65*).

But does not explicitly discloses a security parameter packet inherited by a business object to facilitate access to a subscription platform database. However, Zothner discloses a method for notification subscription filtering based on user role, which further

discloses a security parameter packet inherited by a business object to facilitate access to a subscription platform database (*column 17, lines 53-65*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for Reunert et al to include inheriting security options. One would have been motivated to do in order to reduce development cost (*see column 2, lines 62-67 of Zothner*).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatoumata Traore whose telephone number is (571) 270-1685. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and every other Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami, can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2685.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Friday, March 12, 2010

/F. T./

Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Nasser Moazzami/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436